

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,349,304 to Boldt et al. (hereinafter "Boldt") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,346 to Hanson (hereinafter "Hanson").

Claims 1-10

Claim 1 recites a method of configuring a printer, the method comprising [emphasis added]:

- creating a *printer menu structure*; and
- installing the printer menu structure on the printer, wherein the printer menu structure is installed on an erasable storage device in the printer.

In the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action argues that Boldt discloses creating a printer menu structure and cites column 3, lines 53-60 of Boldt. Column 3, lines 53-60 of Boldt include:

Preferred embodiments allow a network administrator or other user to use a computer 4a, b, c, d to *configure features with values* within printers 8a, b, c, d throughout the network. Some of the features the computer 4a, b, c, d may *configure with values* within network printers 8a, b, c, d via the network 10 include:

Applicant respectfully submits that the Boldt reference does not disclose creating a printer menu structure as recited in claim 1. Rather, Boldt simply discloses copying configuration settings from one printer to another over a

network. Boldt's configuration settings are not analogous to Applicant's *printer menu structure*.

Example configuration settings disclosed in Boldt include setting whether the printer runs in duplex mode, console lock settings, toner density settings, print quality, power save delay, and localization settings. (See Boldt, column 3, line 60 – column 6, line 19.) These configuration settings define the manner in which the printer operates. However, these configuration settings do not disclose or suggest creating a printer menu structure as recited in claim 1. Further, nothing in these configuration settings suggest the creation of a printer menu structure.

Hanson also does not disclose or suggest creating a printer menu structure. Since neither Boldt nor Hanson makes any suggestion of creating a printer menu structure, the combination of these references fails to suggest creation of a printer menu structure, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-10 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claims 2-10 are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Claims 11-15

Claim 11 recites a printer comprising [emphasis added]:

- a display panel to display a plurality of menu elements;
- a user interface coupled to the display panel to allow a user to select among the plurality of menu elements; and
- a data communication interface coupled to the display panel to allow the printer to receive a *printer menu structure* from a remote device.

In the rejection of claim 11, the Office Action alleges that Boldt discloses a data communication interface coupled to a display panel to allow a printer to receive a *printer menu structure* from a remote device. The Office Action relies on column 6, lines 34-38 of Boldt, reproduced below, in support of its argument.

The printer file is a data file stored in a storage area of the computer 4a, b, c, d. *Printer files are created to store various printer settings.* The user can then apply the printer file to a printer 8a, b, c, d to configure the printer 8a, b, c, d according to the settings maintained in the printer file.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Boldt does not teach the use of a printer menu structure. Instead, Boldt merely discloses copying configuration settings from one printer to another over a network. The printer file referenced in the portion of Boldt reproduced above simply relates to the file that stores the configuration settings. Neither the configurations settings themselves, nor the file that stores them, are in any way analogous to Applicant's *printer menu structure*. In addition, Hanson does not remedy the deficiencies of Boldt. Further, the combination of Boldt and Hanson do not disclose the printer as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 12-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 11 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claims 12-15 are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 11, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Claims 16-20

Claim 16 recites one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program comprising the following steps [emphasis added]:

- creating a *printer menu structure*; and
- installing the printer menu structure on a printer, wherein the printer menu structure is installed on an erasable storage device in the printer.

In the rejection of claim 16, the Office Action again argues that the Boldt reference discloses creating a printer menu structure and cites column 3, lines 53-60 of Boldt (reproduced above) in support of its argument.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Boldt does not disclose creating a printer menu structure. Rather, Boldt merely discloses copying configuration settings from one printer to another over a network. Boldt's configuration settings are not analogous to the *printer menu structure* recited in claim 16. Hanson also does not disclose or suggest this printer menu structure. Further, the combination of Boldt and Hanson fails to disclose or suggest the printer menu structure of claim 16. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claims 17-20 are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 16, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Conclusion

Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-04-04

By: 

Steven R. Sponseller

Reg. No. 39,384

(509) 324-9256